Matthew 28:19 in Defense of Biblical Authority

Authors: Brian Onang'o and Patrick Ang'asa

Date: June 27, 2025

In the hope of the coming glorious reign of the Lord

I. Introduction: A Challenge to Scripture

In the quiet moments before dawn, when faithful believers open their Bibles seeking truth and comfort, few expect to encounter a battlefield. Yet today, even the most familiar passages face unprecedented assault. Among these attacks, none strikes more directly at the heart of biblical authority than the campaign against Matthew 28:19—the Great Commission that has guided Christian mission for nearly two millennia.

This is not merely an academic dispute confined to scholarly journals. In churches, study groups, and online forums, sincere believers wrestle with disturbing claims: "Matthew 28:19 was never part of the original Bible." "The Catholic Church altered this verse to support the Trinity." "Early manuscripts prove Jesus never spoke these words." Such assertions, often presented with apparent scholarly authority, leave many Christians confused and shaken.

The stakes could not be higher. If these claims were true, they would not only remove a foundational text from Scripture but establish a precedent that any verse could be questioned and discarded based on speculative theories. More troubling still, these arguments often emerge from within the "One True God" movement—believers who share our rejection of Trinitarian doctrine yet employ methods that undermine the very biblical authority they claim to defend.

We write not as defenders of the Trinity, but as guardians of Scripture's integrity. Our position is clear and uncompromising: Matthew 28:19 belongs in our Bibles based on universal manuscript evidence, and the verse requires no Trinitarian interpretation when properly understood through biblical patterns where singular "name" encompasses multiple persons in family authority relationships.

This defense employs a comprehensive methodology that examines manuscript evidence, historical claims, biblical word studies, Ellen White's testimonies, and early Adventist pioneer understanding. We will demonstrate that the attack on Matthew 28:19 represents poor textual criticism that substitutes speculation for evidence, and we will show how early Adventist leaders successfully maintained both biblical authority and non-Trinitarian theology without resorting to textual surgery.

The battle lines are drawn not between Trinitarian and non-Trinitarian interpretations, but between those who trust biblical preservation and those who would remake Scripture according to their theological preferences. In this crucial hour, we must choose whether to follow the solid path of manuscript evidence and prophetic guidance, or the shifting sands of critical theory and conspiracy speculation.

II. Understanding the Opposition: The Scope of the Attack

To properly defend truth, we must first understand the nature and scope of the attack being mounted against Matthew 28:19. These challenges do not emerge from a single source or follow a unified strategy, but together they form a comprehensive assault on biblical authority that demands careful examination.

The Primary Accusation

At the heart of this controversy lies a fundamental claim about the nature of the baptismal formula itself. Critics argue that the phrase "in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit" is inherently and necessarily Trinitarian doctrine—that any acceptance of Matthew 28:19 equals acceptance of Trinitarian theology. This becomes their justification for questioning the verse's authenticity: since they reject the Trinity, they reason, they must also reject any passage that appears to support it.

This reasoning, however attractive to non-Trinitarian believers, contains a fatal flaw. It assumes that every biblical passage mentioning Father, Son, and Holy Spirit together must be interpreted through a Trinitarian lens. By this logic, numerous other scriptures would also become suspect, including 2 Corinthians 13:14: "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all." If we accept the premise that such formulations demand Trinitarian interpretation, we open the door to removing any "difficult" passage that mentions all three persons of the Godhead.

The Manuscript Claims

Having established their theological objection, critics then attempt to support their position with manuscript evidence. They claim that Matthew 28:19 is missing from ancient manuscripts like Codex Sinaiticus, Curetonianus, and Bobiensis. They assert that no manuscript evidence exists for the traditional reading, and that all early manuscripts originally read "in my name" instead of the so-called Trinitarian formula. Most dramatically, they point to church historian Eusebius, claiming he quoted the "original" form as "Go and make disciples in My Name."

These manuscript arguments carry particular weight because they appear to offer objective, scholarly evidence for what might otherwise seem like mere theological preference. If ancient manuscripts truly supported a different reading, even the most conservative believer might feel compelled to question the traditional text.

The Historical Conspiracy

To explain how the alleged "original" reading disappeared from all known manuscripts, critics propose a massive historical conspiracy. They claim the Catholic Church systematically altered the verse in the second and third centuries, that early church fathers prove the verse was changed, and that the Catholic Church has even admitted to changing the baptismal formula. They point to apparent contradictions in early Christian writings, particularly the Didache, as evidence of textual editing designed to promote Trinitarian doctrine.

This conspiracy theory requires remarkable coordination across diverse geographical regions, religious communities, and manuscript traditions. It must account for why Protestant reformers, who had every reason to expose Catholic corruptions, nevertheless preserved these allegedly altered texts. Most troubling, it offers no historical documentation of such a massive textual manipulation—an operation that would have required unprecedented scale and secrecy.

The Appeal to Scholarly Authority

Perhaps most persuasively, critics cite modern scholarly consensus to support their claims. They assert that all contemporary scholars agree the verse is interpolated, that critical commentaries universally reject Matthew 28:19's authenticity, and that sources like the Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics prove its untrustworthiness. They quote Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger as admitting the verse's Roman origin, and claim that major Bible translations acknowledge the formula as "falsely ascribed to Jesus."

These appeals to authority carry particular force in our academic age, where scholarly consensus often determines public opinion on historical questions. The average believer, faced with apparently overwhelming expert testimony, may feel intellectually compelled to accept conclusions that would have been unthinkable to earlier generations of Christians.

The Acts Contradiction

Critics also argue that the book of Acts provides decisive evidence against Matthew 28:19. They point out that Acts records apostles baptizing "in Jesus' name" rather than using the so-called Trinitarian formula, that no Acts passage records the so-called Trinitarian formula being used, and that the apostles would surely have obeyed Jesus if He had given the Matthew 28:19 command. They cite Paul's epistles as confirming only Jesus-name baptism, concluding that early church practice contradicts Matthew 28:19.

This argument appeals to those who value biblical consistency and seek to harmonize apparently contradictory passages. If Matthew 28:19 truly conflicts with Acts, something must give way—and critics argue that the manuscript-supported Acts accounts must take precedence over the allegedly corrupted Gospel text.

The Deceptive "Moderate" Position

Perhaps most dangerous is the attempt to present a "moderate" position that appears to avoid extremes while actually undermining biblical authority. These critics claim: "We don't reject Matthew 28:19 completely, just question the 'Trinitarian part.' " They say they only reject the "tail end" that mentions Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, comparing their approach to rejecting questionable parts of Ellen White's writings while accepting the rest of the Spirit of Prophecy.

This "moderate" approach appears reasonable and scholarly, avoiding the appearance of radical textual criticism while achieving the same result. By questioning only part of the verse rather than rejecting it entirely, critics can maintain an appearance of biblical loyalty while effectively gutting the passage of its content.

The Pioneer Accusations

Finally, critics attempt to enlist early Adventist pioneers in support of their position. They claim that early Adventist Fundamental Principles never used Matthew 28:19 for baptism, that pioneers only baptized in Jesus' name because they knew the verse was corrupted, and that leaders like James White avoided the verse because they recognized its inauthenticity. Most seriously, they claim that Ellen White's writings supporting Matthew 28:19 were falsified by the White Estate, citing H.C. Lacey's letter as proof of systematic corruption.

This strategy proves particularly effective among Seventh-day Adventists, who naturally look to

their pioneers for theological guidance. If these early leaders truly rejected Matthew 28:19, current believers might feel obligated to follow their example.

The Logical Consequences

When we follow this critical methodology to its logical conclusion, the results prove devastating to biblical authority. If these claims were accepted regarding the Bible, any verse could be removed based on theoretical "original readings," manuscript evidence would become secondary to scholarly speculation, the Protestant principle of Sola Scriptura would collapse under critical theory, and biblical authority would yield to human academic consensus. Every "difficult" passage would face potential removal through similar methodology.

The impact on the Spirit of Prophecy would prove equally destructive. Ellen White's reliability would crumble under accusations of systematic falsification, any inconvenient Spirit of Prophecy passage could be dismissed as "corrupted," the prophetic gift would lose authority when subjected to endless critical revision, and God's providence in preserving His messages through His prophet would be denied.

The ultimate result of following this critical methodology leads inevitably to complete loss of biblical and prophetic authority, leaving believers with nothing but human opinion and scholarly speculation as their foundation—exactly what Satan desires to accomplish in the last days.

This, then, is the scope and nature of the attack we face. It presents itself as scholarly and moderate, but its ultimate trajectory leads to the destruction of biblical authority itself. Understanding this larger pattern helps us recognize why a faithful response requires not merely addressing individual claims, but defending the fundamental principles of biblical preservation and interpretation that these attacks seek to undermine.

III. The Manuscript Reality: Evidence Over Speculation

When we turn from theories to actual evidence, the manuscript reality tells a dramatically different story than critics claim. Far from supporting alternative readings or revealing ancient corruptions, the manuscript tradition presents a remarkably consistent witness to the authenticity of Matthew 28:19.

The Universal Witness

Every Greek manuscript of Matthew's Gospel contains the traditional reading of Matthew 28:19. This is not a mere majority position or a probable conclusion—it represents the unanimous testimony of the manuscript tradition across all text types and geographical regions. The Nestle-Aland 28th edition, the gold standard of critical New Testament scholarship, lists no textual variants for Matthew 28:19. This silence speaks volumes: where manuscript evidence varies, critical editions meticulously document every alternative reading, no matter how minor or poorly attested. The absence of any variants indicates that no manuscript evidence supports the alleged alternative readings.

The Byzantine Majority Text tradition, which preserves thousands of manuscripts from diverse locations and time periods, uniformly supports the traditional reading. The Alexandrian text type, favored by modern critical scholars, tells the same story. Whether we examine early papyri, uncial

manuscripts, minuscules, or lectionaries, the testimony remains constant: "baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit."

Debunking the Sinaiticus Myth

One of the most persistent claims involves Codex Sinaiticus, the famous fourth-century manuscript discovered by Constantin Tischendorf. Critics frequently assert that Matthew 28:19 is missing from this ancient witness, using this alleged absence to question the verse's authenticity. This claim, however, is demonstrably false.

Codex Sinaiticus not only contains Matthew 28:19 but preserves it in the traditional form. Anyone with internet access can verify this by visiting the Codex Sinaiticus website, where high-resolution digital images of every page are freely available. The manuscript clearly contains the complete text: "poreuthentes oun mathēteusate panta ta ethnē baptizontes autous eis to onoma tou patros kai tou huiou kai tou hagiou pneumatos" (Going therefore, make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit).

This false claim about Sinaiticus reveals the problematic nature of the entire anti-Matthew 28:19 movement. If critics are willing to make easily disprovable assertions about such basic facts, how can we trust their more complex arguments about ancient church history or patristic citations?

The Patristic Evidence Examined

Critics often point to Eusebius of Caesarea, the fourth-century church historian, claiming that he quoted an alternative form of Matthew 28:19 reading "in my name" rather than the so-called Trinitarian formula. This argument, however, misunderstands the nature of ancient citation practices and ignores crucial contextual factors.

Ancient writers, including Eusebius, frequently paraphrased familiar passages rather than providing exact quotations. They felt free to summarize, emphasize particular aspects, or adapt wording to fit their immediate purposes. Modern standards of precise quotation simply did not exist in the ancient world. When Eusebius occasionally summarized the Great Commission as baptizing "in my name," he was emphasizing Christ's authority as the source of the apostolic mission, not citing a different textual tradition.

Moreover, when precision was required, Eusebius himself quoted the full traditional form. In his formal theological writings, particularly those addressing Christological controversies, he demonstrates clear familiarity with the complete text. This pattern suggests that his abbreviated citations represent stylistic choices rather than textual variants.

Pre-Nicene witnesses actually support the traditional reading. The Didache, dating from 70-100 AD, instructs: "baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit."^1 Justin Martyr, writing around 150 AD, refers to baptism "in the name of God, the Father and Lord of the universe, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit."^2 Tertullian, around 200 AD, explicitly references the baptismal formula.^3 These early sources, predating any alleged Catholic manipulation, consistently support the traditional text.

The Conspiracy's Impossibility

The proposed conspiracy theory faces insurmountable historical and practical obstacles. Critics claim that the Catholic Church systematically altered Matthew 28:19 in the second and third

centuries, but this explanation cannot account for the geographical scope, religious diversity, and practical challenges such an operation would require.

Manuscripts containing Matthew 28:19 exist across vast geographical regions—Egypt, Syria, Palestine, Asia Minor, Greece, Italy, North Africa, and beyond. These regions often maintained hostile relationships with each other, both politically and ecclesiastically. The idea that a central authority could coordinate textual changes across such diverse and often antagonistic territories strains credibility beyond the breaking point.

The religious diversity of manuscript preservers presents another insurmountable obstacle. Catholic monasteries, Orthodox scriptoriums, and even Jewish communities preserved manuscripts containing the traditional reading. Why would Jewish scribes, who had no investment in Christian theological disputes, participate in a conspiracy to support Trinitarian doctrine? Why would Eastern Orthodox communities, who maintained bitter theological and political rivalries with Rome, preserve texts altered to support Roman theological positions?

Most telling, no historical record documents such a massive textual manipulation. Ancient church controversies generated extensive written documentation—we possess detailed records of disputes over much lesser issues. Yet critics can produce no contemporary accounts, no opposing voices, no evidence of resistance to such alleged widespread textual corruption. The silence is deafening.

Protestant Reformers and Textual Integrity

The conspiracy theory faces another fatal flaw: Protestant reformers had every motivation to expose Catholic textual corruptions, yet they universally accepted Matthew 28:19. Luther, Calvin, Tyndale, and other Reformers made careers of challenging Catholic authority and exposing papal errors. They subjected Catholic traditions to withering scrutiny, rejecting practices and doctrines that lacked clear biblical support.

If Matthew 28:19 represented a Catholic textual corruption, the Reformers would have seized upon this evidence with enthusiasm. Their humanist training gave them access to ancient manuscripts and patristic sources. They were intimately familiar with textual criticism and historical analysis. Yet despite their adversarial relationship with Rome and their commitment to Sola Scriptura, they never questioned the authenticity of Matthew 28:19.

This Protestant witness proves particularly significant because these reformers had access to manuscript traditions independent of Catholic control. They consulted Greek Orthodox sources, examined ancient manuscripts in various libraries, and maintained correspondence with Eastern scholars. Their uniform acceptance of Matthew 28:19 indicates that all available manuscript traditions supported the traditional reading.

God's Providence in Preservation

Behind the manuscript evidence lies a deeper theological principle: God's providence in preserving His Word. Scripture itself promises that God's Word will not pass away, that He watches over His Word to perform it, and that His truth endures forever. These promises require not perfect transmission in every detail, but sufficient preservation to maintain the essential message.

The unanimous manuscript testimony to Matthew 28:19 provides exactly such evidence of divine preservation. Across centuries, continents, and cultures, scribes faithfully copied the same essential text. Despite the human frailties that produced occasional copying errors in less significant

passages, the Great Commission remained intact and unchanged. This pattern suggests divine superintendence rather than mere human preservation.

When we examine the manuscript reality with honest eyes, freed from the distortion of conspiracy theories and speculative reconstructions, we find overwhelming evidence for the authenticity of Matthew 28:19. Every manuscript supports it, no manuscript contradicts it, and the early witnesses confirm it. The uniform testimony spans geographical boundaries, crosses denominational lines, and transcends theological disputes.

This manuscript reality provides the solid foundation upon which all other arguments must build. Without manuscript support, theories about original readings remain mere speculation. With such overwhelming manuscript evidence, attempts to remove Matthew 28:19 from Scripture reveal themselves as exercises in wishful thinking rather than responsible textual criticism.

The choice becomes clear: we can trust the abundant, consistent, and universal manuscript evidence, or we can follow speculative theories that require us to believe in conspiracies for which no evidence exists. For those committed to biblical authority and sound scholarship, only one option maintains integrity with both faith and reason.

IV. Biblical Understanding of "Name": The Scripture Interprets Itself

The key to understanding Matthew 28:19 lies not in speculative theories about ancient conspiracies, but in Scripture itself. When we allow the Bible to interpret its own language patterns, we discover that the phrase "in the name of" follows well-established biblical precedents that require no Trinitarian interpretation.

The Hebrew and Greek Foundation

Biblical language operates with precision and consistency that rewards careful study. The Hebrew word *shem*^4 and its Greek equivalent *onoma*^5 carry meanings far richer than our English word "name." These terms encompass concepts of authority, character, reputation, and representation. More significantly for our present study, biblical writers consistently used these words in singular form when referring to multiple persons who shared common authority or family identity.

This linguistic pattern appears throughout Scripture with such regularity that it cannot be dismissed as coincidental. Rather, it represents a fundamental aspect of biblical expression that modern readers often miss due to differences in language and culture. Understanding this pattern proves crucial for properly interpreting Matthew 28:19 and numerous other passages.

Family Names in Singular Form

The biblical pattern becomes immediately apparent when we examine family naming conventions. In Ruth 1:2, we read: "the name of his two sons Mahlon and Chilion." The Hebrew text uses *shem* (name) in singular form despite referring to two distinct individuals. This grammatical construction, which might seem awkward in English, represents standard biblical usage when describing family members who share common identity.

First Chronicles 8:38 provides another clear example: "And Azel had six sons, whose names were, Azrikam, Bocheru, and Ishmael, and Sheariah, and Obadiah, and Hanan." Yet the Hebrew employs

singular "name" (*shem*) rather than plural "*shemot*" for six different sons. This pattern demonstrates that biblical writers felt no awkwardness in using singular "name" to encompass multiple individuals within a family unit.

These examples establish a crucial principle: biblical Hebrew regularly uses singular "name" to identify multiple persons who share family relationships or common identity. This grammatical pattern operates not as an exception requiring explanation, but as standard biblical usage that appears throughout the Old Testament.

Collective Authority Under One Name

The pattern extends beyond family relationships to encompass collective authority structures. In 1 Kings 18:24, Elijah challenges the prophets of Baal: "call ye on the name of your gods." The Hebrew text uses singular "name" (*shem*) while referring to plural "gods" (*elohim*). This construction indicates that multiple deities could be invoked under one collective "name" of authority.

Similarly, in Esther 8:8, we find royal authority exercised collectively: "write in the king's name." Although the king's authority operated through multiple officials and administrators, they all acted under the singular "name" of royal authority. This pattern reveals how biblical language naturally accommodated complex authority relationships within simple grammatical structures.

Genesis 48:16 provides perhaps the most illuminating example for our present study. Jacob blesses Joseph's sons: "let my name be named on them, and the name of my fathers Abraham and Isaac." Here we see three patriarchal names (Abraham, Isaac, Jacob) forming one family identity that would be carried by two boys (Ephraim and Manasseh). Five distinct persons are encompassed within the singular concept of patriarchal "name" and authority.

New Testament Patterns

The New Testament continues these Old Testament patterns with remarkable consistency. In Colossians 3:17, Paul instructs: "And whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him." This passage demonstrates how singular "name" can encompass relationship with both Father and Son, as thanksgiving directed through Jesus' name reaches both Jesus and the Father.

Ephesians 5:20 reinforces this pattern: "Giving thanks always for all things unto God and the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ." Again, one action (thanksgiving) directed to God and the Father operates through the singular "name" of Jesus Christ. These passages establish clear New Testament precedent for understanding how singular "name" can encompass multiple persons in divine relationship.

The Greek preposition *eis* in Matthew 28:19 adds another layer of meaning often overlooked in English translations. Most versions render the phrase as "in the name," but the Greek literally means "into the name." This preposition carries the sense of movement or transfer, suggesting that baptism represents a transfer of ownership or allegiance rather than mere ceremonial action. First-century commercial and legal documents regularly used this formula (*eis to onoma*) for property transfers and banking transactions.[13]

Matthew 28:19 in Biblical Context

When we apply these biblical patterns to Matthew 28:19, the verse's meaning becomes clear and natural. The singular "name" (*onoma*) follows established biblical precedent for referring to multiple persons who share family authority structure. Father, Son, and Holy Spirit represent the divine family working together under one authority and identity, just as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob shared one patriarchal name and authority.

This interpretation requires no Trinitarian doctrine. The Father remains supreme God and source of all authority. The Son operates as God's literal Son, begotten before creation and possessing derived authority. The Holy Spirit functions as God's divine presence and the Spirit of both God and Christ, all working together under the singular "name" of divine authority.

Early Adventist understanding recognized this biblical pattern instinctively. They understood that baptism "in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit" represented recognition of the Father as supreme God, acknowledgment of Christ as God's Son and our Savior, and acceptance of the Holy Spirit's work in conversion.

The Harmony with Acts

This biblical understanding naturally harmonizes Matthew 28:19 with Acts baptisms without requiring textual surgery or conspiracy theories. When Acts records baptisms performed "in Jesus' name," it describes the authority under which baptism was performed, not necessarily the precise words spoken. The apostles baptized by Christ's authority, according to Christ's command, which included the full recognition of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

Consider the parallel with John's baptism. Luke 20:4-6 records that Jesus acknowledged John's baptism as "from heaven," yet we have no record of specific words John pronounced during baptism. No one suggests that John's baptism was invalid because we lack the precise formula advocated by the critics (in Jesus name). Similarly, the absence of recorded formulas in Acts baptisms cannot be used to argue against Matthew 28:19.

The Gospel of Luke and the book of Acts, both written by the same author, present no contradiction between Jesus' commission and apostolic practice. Luke records both the command (most notably in Luke 24:47: "repentance for the forgiveness of sins will be preached in his name to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem") and its implementation (in Acts), including where baptism is not said to be done "in the name of Jesus" as in the case of Paul's and the Ethiopian Eunach's, without sensing any inconsistency. This apostolic harmony suggests that early Christians understood these passages as complementary rather than contradictory.

Theological Implications

This biblical pattern reveals profound theological truths about God's nature and character. The use of singular "name" for Father, Son, and Holy Spirit indicates divine unity of purpose, character, and authority.

This understanding preserves both biblical monotheism and the distinct personalities revealed in Scripture. The Father remains the ultimate source and authority, the Son serves as the visible revelation and mediator, and the Holy Spirit is their active presence and power. Their cooperation under one "name" demonstrates perfect harmony and shared character without requiring the metaphysical complexities of Trinitarian doctrine.

When we allow Scripture to interpret itself through established linguistic patterns, Matthew 28:19 emerges not as a Trinitarian interpolation, but as a beautiful expression of biblical truth about God's family working together for human salvation. The verse requires no special explanation, no textual emendation, and no historical conspiracy to make sense within its biblical context.

This approach demonstrates the wisdom of the Protestant principle that Scripture is its own interpreter. Rather than imposing external theological frameworks or accepting speculative historical reconstructions, we can find clear and satisfying answers by carefully observing how the Bible itself uses language and expresses spiritual truth.

The pattern is consistent, the examples are numerous, and the application to Matthew 28:19 is natural and seamless. When we understand how biblical writers used singular "name" to encompass multiple persons in authority relationships, the Great Commission takes its proper place as an authentic expression of Jesus' final instructions to His disciples.

V. The Spirit of Prophecy Witness: Confirmation and Warning

Ellen White's consistent testimony provides crucial confirmation of Matthew 28:19's authenticity, while her prophetic warnings help us understand the spiritual dynamics behind current attacks on both Scripture and the testimonies themselves.

The Predicted Attack

With remarkable foresight, Ellen White predicted the very strategy now being employed against Matthew 28:19 and her own writings. In Testimonies volume 5, pages 671-672, she warned: "It is Satan's plan to weaken the faith of God's people in the Testimonies. Satan knows how to make his attacks. He works upon minds to excite jealousy and dissatisfaction toward those at the head of the work. The gifts are next questioned; then, of course, they have but little weight, and instruction given through vision is disregarded."^6

This prophetic description perfectly captures the current assault on biblical authority. First comes the attack on leadership and institutional authority, followed by questions about the gifts themselves, ultimately leading to disregard for inspired instruction. The progression from questioning church leaders (of whom Marian Davis qualifies in the context to be part of) to questioning Scripture follows exactly the pattern Ellen White predicted.

In Selected Messages volume 1, page 48, she provided an even more specific warning: "Satan is constantly pressing in the spurious—to lead away from the truth. The very last deception of Satan will be to make of none effect the testimony of the Spirit of God… Satan will work ingeniously, in different ways and through different agencies, to unsettle the confidence of God's remnant people in the true testimony."^7

These predictions prove particularly significant because they identify the ultimate target: making "of none effect the testimony of the Spirit of God." Current attacks on Matthew 28:19 and Ellen White's writings represent exactly this strategy—undermining confidence in both biblical and prophetic authority through sophisticated intellectual arguments.

The Fanny Bolton Precedent

History provides instructive parallels to current controversies. Between 1888 and 1896, Fanny Alger Bolton, who worked as Ellen White's literary assistant, later claimed that she had largely written several Ellen White books, including Steps to Christ. She alleged that the White Estate had suppressed her contributions and falsified authorship, and that Ellen White's published works contained significant alterations from original manuscripts.

These accusations sound remarkably familiar to current claims about systematic corruption of Ellen White's writings. The Bolton case demonstrates how personal conflicts can generate false accusations about institutional practices, and how disgruntled former employees may make exaggerated claims about their contributions.

The White Estate addressed Bolton's claims through careful documentation. They produced extensive manuscript evidence showing Ellen White's personal handwriting and dictation notes predating Bolton's involvement. Multiple independent witnesses testified to Ellen White's personal composition methods and Bolton's limited editorial role. Chronological analysis revealed that many contested passages existed in earlier publications before Bolton's employment. Most significantly, the pattern showed that Bolton's claims emerged during a period of personal conflict and financial disputes with the White Estate.

The Bolton case establishes important principles for evaluating similar accusations. First, documentary evidence and independent witnesses prove crucial for establishing truth. Second, chronological analysis often exposes the impossibility of alleged alterations. Third, personal conflicts can motivate false accusations about institutional practices. Fourth, the timing of accusations often reveals their true motivation.

The H.C. Lacey Letter Examined

Current critics often cite H.C. Lacey's letter as evidence of systematic corruption in Ellen White's published works. This approach, however, repeats the methodological errors evident in the Bolton case while adding new complications.

Lacey's letter to L.E. Froom, dated August 1945, claimed that significant alterations had been made to The Desire of Ages during its 1898 publication. The chronological impossibility of these claims becomes immediately apparent when we consider the timeline: The Desire of Ages was published in 1898, seventeen years before Ellen White's death in July 1915. Earlier works like Spirit of Prophecy volume 2 appeared in 1877, thirty-eight years before her death. Early manuscripts dating to the 1850s-1870s preceded her death by forty-five to sixty-five years.

Lacey's accusations emerged in 1945, thirty years after Ellen White's death. If systematic corruption had occurred during her lifetime, why did these allegations not surface until decades after she could no longer respond? Why did contemporary witnesses not report such extensive editorial interference? How could alterations spanning decades remain undetected by those working closely with Ellen White?

More fundamentally, Lacey's allegations remain unsubstantiated by objective manuscript evidence. Independent manuscript research has not confirmed his claims about significant alterations. His accusations arose during a period of theological controversy and personal conflict, following the pattern evident in the Bolton case.

Ellen White's Authentic Witness to Matthew 28:19

When we turn from accusations to Ellen White's actual writings, we find consistent, clear, and repeated endorsement of Matthew 28:19 throughout her ministry. These testimonies span decades, appear in multiple publications, and demonstrate intimate familiarity with the passage's meaning and application.

In The Acts of the Apostles, page 28, Ellen White wrote:^9 "The disciples were to carry their work forward in Christ's name. Their every word and act was to fasten attention on His name, as possessing that vital power by which sinners may be saved. Their faith was to center in Him who is the source of mercy and power. In His name they were to present their petitions to the Father, and they would receive answer. They were to baptize in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Christ's name was to be their watchword, their badge of distinction, their bond of union, the authority for their course of action, and the source of their success. Nothing was to be recognized in His kingdom that did not bear His name and superscription."

This passage demonstrates Ellen White's sophisticated understanding of the relationship between baptizing "in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit" and carrying forward work "in Christ's name." Rather than seeing contradiction, she perceived harmony—baptism according to Christ's commission represented one aspect of comprehensive ministry conducted under His authority.

Spirit of Prophecy volume 2, page 136, provides even more illuminating insight:^10 "The prejudice of the Jews was aroused because the disciples of Jesus did not use the EXACT WORDS of John in the rite of baptism. John baptized unto repentance, BUT THE DISCIPLES OF JESUS, ON PROFESSION OF THE FAITH, BAPTIZED IN THE NAME OF THE FATHER, SON, AND HOLY SPIRIT. The teachings of John were in perfect harmony with those of Jesus, yet his disciples became jealous for fear his influence was diminishing. A DISPUTE AROSE BETWEEN THEM AND THE DISCIPLES OF JESUS IN REGARD TO THE 'FORM OF WORDS' PROPER TO USE AT BAPTISM, and finally as to the right of the latter to baptize at all."

This remarkable passage addresses directly the current controversy over baptismal formulas. Ellen White understood that disputes over "EXACT WORDS" and "FORM OF WORDS" had ancient precedent, arising even between followers of John and Jesus. She recognized that different expressions could convey the same essential truth, and that fixation on precise formulas could lead to unnecessary controversy.

Her insight proves particularly relevant to current debates. Just as ancient disputes about baptismal words reflected deeper conflicts about authority and teaching, modern arguments about Matthew 28:19 often mask theological disagreements about Scripture's authority and interpretation.

Additional testimonies reinforce early Adventist acceptance of Matthew 28:19. In Spiritual Gifts volume 3, page 9, James White wrote approvingly in his introduction:^11 "the ministers of the nineteenth century baptize 'In the name of the father, and of the son, and of the Holy Ghost,' Because the original commission requires it." Significantly, this endorsement came from James White himself, indicating that even the most cautious early Adventist leaders saw no problem with the traditional reading.

Testimonies for the Church volume 6, page 91, declares:^12 "Those who are baptized in the threefold name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, at the very entrance of their Christian life declare publicly that they have forsaken the service of Satan and have become members of the royal family,

children of the heavenly King."

The Warning Against Critical Approaches

Ellen White provided specific warnings against the critical approaches now being used to undermine both Scripture and her own writings. In Selected Messages volume 1, page 17, she cautioned: "When men, in their finite judgment, find it necessary to go into an examination of scriptures to define that which is inspired and that which is not, they have stepped before Jesus to show Him a better way than He has led them."

This warning directly addresses current methodology that seeks to distinguish "authentic" from "inauthentic" portions of Scripture based on human scholarly judgment. Ellen White identifies such approaches as presumptuous attempts to correct divine revelation according to human understanding.

She further warned in the same volume, page 20: "The Bible is not given to us in grand superhuman language… It is written by men, but it is not the production of the finite mind of man." This statement recognizes both human agency in biblical composition and divine superintendence in the process—a balance that protects against both mechanical dictation theories and purely human origin theories.

Perhaps most pointedly, she predicted: "Satan has ability to suggest doubts and to devise objections to the pointed testimony that God sends, and many think it a virtue, a mark of intelligence in them, to be unbelieving and to question and quibble. Those who desire to doubt will have plenty of room. God does not propose to remove all occasion for unbelief."

This warning perfectly describes current intellectual climate, where questioning traditional beliefs is often presented as evidence of scholarly sophistication and independent thinking. Ellen White identifies this attitude as satanic deception designed to undermine confidence in divine revelation.

The Pattern Fulfilled

Current attacks on Matthew 28:19 and Ellen White's writings follow precisely the pattern she predicted. First comes the attack on institutional authority and leadership. Then follow questions about the authenticity and reliability of inspired writings. Finally comes the wholesale rejection of divine guidance in favor of human scholarly judgment.

The sophisticated intellectual arguments, the appeal to scholarly consensus, the claim to represent genuine historical research—all these elements follow Satan's predicted strategy of making "of none effect the testimony of the Spirit of God." The very fact that these attacks emerge from within religious communities that profess high regard for Scripture and Ellen White's writings makes them more dangerous than outright secular criticism.

Ellen White's consistent testimony provides both confirmation of Matthew 28:19's authenticity and insight into the spiritual forces behind current attacks. Her prophetic warnings help us understand that this controversy involves more than academic disagreement—it represents a fundamental battle over the authority of divine revelation itself.

When we weigh Ellen White's clear, consistent, and repeated endorsement of Matthew 28:19 against unsubstantiated accusations of textual corruption, the choice becomes clear. Her authentic witness, preserved in multiple publications across decades of ministry, provides decisive evidence for the verse's integrity and proper interpretation.

VI. Pioneer Wisdom Vindicated: Early Adventist Leaders Show the Way

Early Adventist leaders faced theological challenges remarkably similar to those confronting believers today, and their response provides both instruction and inspiration for our current situation. Rather than resorting to textual criticism that would remove difficult passages from Scripture, these pioneers demonstrated how sound biblical interpretation could maintain both scriptural authority and non-Trinitarian theology.

The False Accusations

Current critics level serious charges against early Adventist pioneers, claiming they avoided or rejected Matthew 28:19 because they recognized its inauthenticity. These accusations represent a fundamental misunderstanding of pioneer theological method and historical record. Rather than supporting the anti-Matthew 28:19 position, careful examination of pioneer writings reveals exactly the opposite: consistent acceptance and integration of the passage within their theological framework.

The claim that early Adventist Fundamental Principles never used Matthew 28:19 for baptism reflects misunderstanding about the nature and purpose of these doctrinal statements. The Fundamental Principles focused on defining core doctrinal positions that distinguished Seventh-day Adventists from other religious groups. They addressed controverted points where Adventist understanding differed from prevailing Christian beliefs. The absence of Matthew 28:19 in these statements indicates not rejection, but the fact that the verse wasn't controversial among early Adventists—they saw no conflict between the passage and their theological understanding.

Similarly, the assertion that pioneers only baptized in Jesus' name because they knew Matthew 28:19 was corrupted lacks historical evidence. Pioneer baptismal practices varied, and documentation reveals no pattern of avoiding the traditional formula due to textual concerns. Ellen White's consistent endorsement of the verse, examined in the previous chapter, demonstrates official acceptance rather than suspicion or rejection.

James White's Biblical Courage

James White, the most prominent early Adventist leader, actually defended biblical authority against precisely the kind of critical approaches now being used to attack Matthew 28:19. His theological method emphasized careful biblical exegesis combined with unwavering commitment to scriptural authority. He consistently opposed attempts to remove or question biblical passages based on speculative theories.

White's introduction to Spiritual Gifts volume 3 provides decisive evidence of his position. He wrote approvingly that "the ministers of the nineteenth century baptize 'In the name of the father, and of the son, and of the Holy Ghost,' Because the original commission requires it." This statement, written by James White himself in the introduction, demonstrates clear acceptance of Matthew 28:19 as authentic Scripture requiring obedience.

White's broader theological approach reinforced this commitment to biblical authority. He consistently argued that Scripture must be allowed to interpret itself, that human theories cannot override biblical testimony, and that speculative criticism undermines rather than strengthens faith. His

opposition to liberal theological trends that questioned biblical reliability established principles directly applicable to current Matthew 28:19 controversies.

Most significantly, White distinguished between questioning human interpretations of Scripture and questioning Scripture itself. He freely challenged Trinitarian interpretations of various passages while maintaining absolute confidence in biblical reliability. This approach provided a model for contemporary believers: we can reject theological conclusions while affirming textual authenticity.

J.N. Andrews' Integration

John Nevins Andrews, widely regarded as the most scholarly of early Adventist pioneers, demonstrated sophisticated integration of Matthew 28:19 within non-Trinitarian theology. His approach proves particularly instructive because he combined rigorous biblical scholarship with clear theological commitment to early Adventist distinctive beliefs.

In his article "Baptism in Water," published in the Review and Herald, January 22, 1880, Andrews wrote:^14 "CHRISTIAN baptism is baptism in water, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit… Christ commissioned his disciples to baptize in water in his name, but no man can baptize with the Holy Spirit, Christ alone can do this." This statement demonstrates several crucial points.

First, Andrews fully accepted Matthew 28:19 as authentic biblical text requiring Christian obedience. He showed no hesitation about citing the passage or treating it as genuine scriptural instruction. Second, he distinguished between different types of baptism—water baptism performed by human ministers according to Christ's commission, and Holy Spirit baptism performed by Christ alone. This distinction allowed him to harmonize Matthew 28:19 with Acts passages without resorting to textual criticism.

Third, Andrews understood that disciples baptized "in his name"—that is, by Christ's authority and according to His commission. The phrase "in his name" referred to the source of authority rather than the specific words pronounced during the ceremony. This insight resolved the apparent contradiction between Matthew 28:19 and Acts baptisms through sound exegetical principle rather than speculative historical reconstruction.

Andrews' theological method provides a model for contemporary believers facing similar challenges. Rather than questioning biblical reliability when passages seem difficult to harmonize, he employed careful exegesis to understand how different biblical statements complemented rather than contradicted each other. His approach maintained both scriptural authority and theological integrity.

Wilcox and Waggoner's Synthesis

M.C. Wilcox and E.J. Waggoner, prominent second-generation Adventist leaders, articulated perhaps the most sophisticated early Adventist understanding of Matthew 28:19. Their editorial analysis, published in Signs of the Times on June 3, 1897,^15 demonstrated remarkable theological maturity in addressing the relationship between the Matthean commission and Acts baptisms.

Wilcox and Waggoner began by acknowledging that the words of Matthew 28:19 "are not designed to express an exact form that should always be used, but to express an important fact as to what true discipleship means." This insight proves crucial for understanding current controversies. They recognized that biblical passages often express spiritual principles rather than providing rigid liturgical formulas.

Their analysis then proceeded to explain the spiritual significance of each element in the baptismal formula. Baptism "into the name of the Father" represented receiving divine mercy, compassion, forgiveness, and righteousness. Baptism "into the name of the Son" signified renouncing self and consecrating everything to God's service. Baptism "into the name of the Holy Ghost" indicated empowerment for Christian service through divine energy and life-force.

Most significantly, they concluded: "And yet while the matter is expressed in detail in Matt. 28:19, 'into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost,' it is all included in the name of Jesus Christ; 'for in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. And ye are complete in him.' Col. 2:9, 10. In him was the Father's name or character, his own character, and the fulness of the Spirit. Therefore when we read that the apostles baptized in his name, they carried out our Lord's injunction."

This synthesis beautifully harmonized Matthew 28:19 with Acts baptisms without requiring textual criticism or conspiracy theories. Wilcox and Waggoner understood that baptism in Jesus' name encompassed the full reality expressed in detailed form in Matthew 28:19. The Acts descriptions represented summary statements rather than contradictory instructions.

Their theological insight demonstrates sophisticated understanding of how biblical language operates. Rather than demanding wooden literalism that would create artificial conflicts between passages, they recognized how different biblical statements could express the same spiritual reality with varying degrees of detail and emphasis.

Uriah Smith's Scholarly Defense

Uriah Smith, longtime editor of the Review and Herald and systematic theologian of early Adventism, consistently defended Scripture's reliability while maintaining non-Trinitarian interpretation. His theological writings demonstrate how careful scholarship could support biblical authority without compromising distinctive Adventist beliefs.

Smith's approach emphasized thorough biblical research combined with logical analysis of theological claims. He regularly addressed challenges to biblical reliability, demonstrating how alleged contradictions dissolved under careful examination. His method provided foundation for contemporary believers facing similar intellectual challenges.

Most importantly, Smith distinguished between questioning theological interpretations and questioning biblical authenticity. He freely challenged prevailing interpretations of passages related to the state of the dead, the Sabbath, and prophetic interpretation while maintaining absolute confidence in biblical reliability. This approach enabled him to defend Adventist distinctive beliefs without undermining scriptural authority.

The Pioneer Legacy

Early Adventist pioneers demonstrated that biblical authority and non-Trinitarian theology could coexist without requiring textual surgery or conspiracy theories. Their approach rested on several key principles that remain relevant for contemporary believers.

First, they maintained absolute confidence in biblical preservation and reliability. While acknowledging human fallibility in interpretation, they trusted that God had preserved His Word sufficiently for salvation and doctrinal instruction. This confidence enabled them to seek better understanding rather than questioning textual authenticity when passages seemed difficult.

Second, they employed careful exegetical method that allowed Scripture to interpret itself. Rather than imposing external theological frameworks or accepting speculative historical reconstructions, they sought to understand how biblical passages related to each other within the overall scriptural witness.

Third, they distinguished between spiritual principles and liturgical formulas. They recognized that biblical passages often expressed essential truths that could be implemented with varying degrees of detail and emphasis. This insight enabled them to harmonize apparently contradictory statements without resorting to textual criticism.

Fourth, they maintained clear priorities regarding biblical authority versus theological speculation. When forced to choose between preserving scriptural reliability and accommodating human theories, they consistently chose biblical authority.

The pioneer example demonstrates that current attacks on Matthew 28:19 represent departure from rather than continuation of early Adventist theological method. These leaders would have rejected attempts to remove verses from Scripture based on unsubstantiated conspiracy theories or speculative historical reconstructions.

Their legacy calls contemporary believers to maintain the same confidence in biblical authority while seeking ever deeper understanding of scriptural truth. Rather than following the destructive path of textual criticism that removes uncomfortable passages, we can follow the pioneer example of faithful interpretation that honors both Scripture's authority and its intended meaning.

The pioneers faced their theological challenges with wisdom, scholarship, and unwavering commitment to biblical authority. Their example provides both instruction and encouragement for believers facing similar challenges today. By following their principles rather than current critical methods, we can maintain both intellectual integrity and spiritual faithfulness in our approach to Scripture and its interpretation.

VII. Biblical Harmony Demonstrated: Unity Without Uniformity

Rather than revealing contradiction between Matthew 28:19 and Acts baptisms, careful biblical study demonstrates the beautiful consistency that characterizes divine revelation. Scripture provides its own examples of how the same divine truth can be expressed through varied formulations without compromising essential meaning or creating theological conflicts.

The Precedent of John's Baptism

The foundation for understanding different baptismal expressions appears in the ministry of John the Baptist himself. In Luke 20:4-6, Jesus acknowledged John's baptism as "from heaven," validating its divine origin and authority. Yet nowhere in Scripture do we find recorded the specific words John pronounced during baptism. No one suggests that John's baptism was invalid or questionable because we lack documentation of his precise formula.

This precedent proves crucial for evaluating current arguments against Matthew 28:19. If the absence of recorded baptismal words in John's case creates no theological problem, why should similar absence in Acts passages be used to question the authenticity of Jesus' commission? The parallel suggests that biblical writers focused on the authority and significance of baptism rather than preserving exact liturgical formulations.

Moreover, we know that several of Jesus' disciples, including Andrew and Peter, had been baptized by John before following Jesus. Yet we find no record of their rebaptism when they committed to following Christ. This pattern indicates that the spiritual reality of baptism transcended specific verbal formulations—what mattered was the heart commitment and divine authority behind the ceremony.

The rebaptism recorded in Acts 19 involved people who had misunderstood John's fundamental message. These individuals claimed to have received John's baptism but knew nothing about the Holy Spirit—an impossibility if they had truly understood John's teaching about the coming Messiah who would baptize with the Holy Spirit. Their situation resulted from inadequate instruction rather than deficient baptismal formulas, serving as a warning to present ministers about the importance of thorough preparation before baptism.

The Elisha-Jehu Example: Different Words, Same Authority

Scripture provides a remarkable parallel to current baptismal controversies in the account of Elisha's commission to anoint Jehu as king of Israel. This Old Testament example demonstrates how the same divine authority can be expressed through different words and varying levels of detail without compromising the essential message.

In 2 Kings 9:1-3, Elisha instructed a young prophet with specific but brief directions: "Thus saith the LORD, I have anointed thee king over Israel… anoint him king over Israel… open the door and flee." The commission was simple and direct, focusing on the essential action and its divine authorization.

However, when the prophet actually delivered the message in 2 Kings 9:6-10, his words proved far more extensive and detailed: "Thus saith the LORD God of Israel, I have anointed thee king over the people of the LORD, even over Israel." The prophet then delivered an extended prophetic message including detailed judgment against Ahab's house and specific prophecy about Jezebel's fate—much more than Elisha's original instructions contained.

Several crucial distinctions appear between Elisha's instructions and the prophet's delivery. The divine title expanded from "Thus saith the LORD" to "Thus saith the LORD God of Israel." The authority scope grew from "king over Israel" to "king over the people of the LORD, even over Israel." The message length increased dramatically from brief instructions to extensive prophetic declaration.

Yet both messages carried identical divine authority despite their different wording and scope. The prophet's expanded delivery didn't contradict Elisha's simpler instructions—it fulfilled them with greater detail and emphasis. The essential truth remained constant while the expression varied according to the specific context and audience.

This biblical example provides a perfect parallel for understanding the relationship between Matthew 28:19 and Acts baptisms. Jesus' commission in Matthew represents the detailed instructions, while Acts passages provide summary descriptions of how the apostles implemented those instructions. The varying expressions reflect different purposes—commission versus historical narrative—while maintaining identical spiritual authority and meaning.

Gospel Writers and Varied Expression

The Gospel writers themselves demonstrate how the same divine truth can be recorded with different details and emphasis without creating contradiction. The temptation accounts in Matthew and Luke provide instructive examples of this principle in operation.

Matthew 4:3 records Satan's first temptation using plural "stones," while Luke 4:3 uses singular "stone"—the same temptation with different specificity levels. Luke 4:5 adds the detail "in a moment of time" to the second temptation, providing additional context absent from Matthew's account. Most significantly, Matthew and Luke sequence the second and third temptations differently, demonstrating that chronological arrangement could vary while maintaining the same essential account.

The responses also show variation in expression. Matthew 4:7 records Jesus saying "It is written again," while Luke 4:12 has "It is said"—the same authoritative response to Satan's challenge expressed with different wording. Both evangelists record Jesus using Scripture against Satan with identical meaning but varied expression.

If Matthew and Luke can record the same temptation event with different details, order, and wording while maintaining identical truth, then Matthew's baptismal commission and Acts' implementation descriptions can certainly coexist without contradiction. The principle of divine truth expressed through varied human language accounts for these differences without requiring textual criticism or conspiracy theories.

The Pattern Established

This biblical evidence establishes a clear pattern for understanding how divine revelation operates through human language. Scripture consistently demonstrates that the same spiritual reality can be expressed through different formulations without compromising essential truth or creating theological problems.

Matthew 28:19 represents Christ's detailed commission specifying the full authority of God operating through Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The passage establishes the theological foundation for Christian baptism by identifying the divine authority under which the ceremony operates and the spiritual relationships it acknowledges.

Acts passages provide historical accounts using summary descriptions rather than detailed theological exposition. When Luke records baptisms performed "in Jesus' name," he describes the ultimate authority under which baptism was conducted—by Christ's commission and according to His instructions. The phrase identifies the source of authorization rather than necessarily quoting the exact words pronounced during the ceremony.

The Acts descriptions function as summary statements indicating that baptism was performed according to Christ's authority rather than human tradition. "In Jesus' name" signifies "by Christ's authority" and "according to Christ's command," which included the comprehensive recognition of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit outlined in Matthew 28:19.

This understanding harmonizes all biblical passages without requiring removal of any text or acceptance of unsubstantiated conspiracy theories. The varied expressions reflect different purposes—commission versus implementation, theological instruction versus historical narrative—while maintaining the same underlying spiritual reality.

Biblical Precedent for Comprehensive Summary

Scripture provides additional examples of how comprehensive spiritual realities can be summarized through shorter expressions. The name "Jesus" itself encompasses the full work of salvation, yet saying "Jesus saves" doesn't negate the detailed description of salvation involving Father, Son, and Holy Spirit found elsewhere in Scripture.

Similarly, Paul's declaration in Colossians 2:9-10 that "in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. And ye are complete in him" indicates how Christ's name can encompass the full divine reality. When Acts records baptism "in Jesus' name," it acknowledges this comprehensive spiritual truth rather than contradicting the detailed expression found in Matthew 28:19.

The Harmony Achieved

When we understand these biblical principles of varied expression, the apparent tension between Matthew 28:19 and Acts baptisms disappears entirely. Both passages describe the same spiritual reality—baptism performed according to Christ's authority and commission—with different levels of detail appropriate to their specific purposes.

Matthew 28:19 provides the theological foundation, establishing the divine authority and spiritual relationships acknowledged in Christian baptism. Acts provides historical implementation, showing how the apostles carried out Christ's commission in various circumstances. The harmony between these passages demonstrates the beautiful consistency of biblical revelation when properly understood.

This understanding eliminates any need for textual criticism, conspiracy theories, or removal of biblical passages. Instead of contradiction requiring resolution through scholarly reconstruction, we find complementary accounts that reinforce each other while serving different literary and theological purposes.

The biblical precedent for varied expression of consistent divine authority provides solid foundation for maintaining both Matthew 28:19 and Acts baptisms as equally authentic and harmonious parts of divine revelation. Rather than creating problems requiring complicated solutions, these passages demonstrate the rich diversity of expression that characterizes inspired writing while maintaining essential spiritual unity.

This harmony reflects the wisdom of divine revelation that accommodates human language limitations while preserving essential truth. God speaks to us through varied expressions that enrich rather than confuse our understanding when approached with faith and careful study rather than skepticism and critical suspicion.

VIII. Conclusion: The Battle Defined

Now we see clearly what this battle is really about. The controversy surrounding Matthew 28:19 represents far more than disagreement over a single verse or debate about ancient manuscripts. At its core, this conflict concerns the fundamental question of biblical authority versus human speculation in determining Christian faith and practice.

The Real Issue Revealed

The issue is not whether we can remove verses from Scripture that seem to support doctrines we reject. The issue is whether we will trust the overwhelming manuscript evidence that uniformly supports Matthew 28:19, or whether we will follow speculative theories that require us to believe in massive conspiracies for which no historical evidence exists.

The issue is not whether Matthew 28:19 requires Trinitarian interpretation. Biblical word study clearly demonstrates that singular "name" can encompass multiple persons in family authority relationships, and early Adventist pioneers successfully maintained both acceptance of the verse and rejection of Trinitarian doctrine.

The issue is not whether Acts baptisms contradict Matthew 28:19. Scripture itself provides abundant examples of how the same divine truth can be expressed through varied formulations, and proper understanding of biblical language patterns resolves apparent contradictions without requiring textual surgery.

The real issue is whether we will follow the solid path of biblical preservation and prophetic guidance, or the shifting sands of critical theory and conspiracy speculation. Will we trust God's providence in preserving His Word, or will we assume that human scholarship must correct what divine revelation allegedly failed to preserve accurately?

The Pioneer Example

Early Adventist leaders faced theological challenges remarkably similar to those confronting believers today, and their response provides both instruction and inspiration. Rather than questioning biblical reliability when passages seemed difficult to harmonize with their theological understanding, they employed careful exegesis to discover how different biblical statements complemented rather than contradicted each other.

James White defended biblical authority against critical approaches that would remove verses based on speculative theories. In his introduction to Spiritual Gifts volume 3, he explicitly endorsed the Matthew 28:19 formula because "the original commission requires it." He demonstrated how to distinguish between questioning human interpretations of Scripture and questioning Scripture itself.

J.N. Andrews integrated Matthew 28:19 within non-Trinitarian theology by recognizing that disciples baptized "in his name"—by Christ's authority and according to His commission. This insight resolved apparent contradictions through sound exegetical principle rather than speculative historical reconstruction.

M.C. Wilcox and E.J. Waggoner articulated sophisticated understanding of how the detailed expression in Matthew 28:19 was "all included in the name of Jesus Christ" because "in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily."^15 Their synthesis harmonized Matthew and Acts without requiring textual criticism.

Ellen White consistently endorsed Matthew 28:19 throughout her ministry while explaining that disputes over "EXACT WORDS" and "FORM OF WORDS" had ancient precedent. She understood that different expressions could convey the same essential truth, and that fixation on precise formulas could lead to unnecessary controversy.

These pioneers demonstrated that biblical authority and non-Trinitarian theology could coexist

without requiring textual surgery or conspiracy theories. Their approach rested on absolute confidence in biblical preservation, careful exegetical method that allowed Scripture to interpret itself, recognition that biblical passages often expressed spiritual principles rather than rigid formulas, and clear priorities regarding biblical authority versus theological speculation.

The Call to Faithful Response

The pioneer example calls contemporary believers to the same confidence in biblical authority while seeking ever deeper understanding of scriptural truth. Rather than following the destructive path of textual criticism that removes uncomfortable passages, we can follow the pioneer example of faithful interpretation that honors both Scripture's authority and its intended meaning.

This requires intellectual courage to resist popular academic trends that prioritize human scholarship over biblical testimony. It demands spiritual discernment to recognize the difference between legitimate scholarly inquiry and speculative theory disguised as objective research. Most importantly, it calls for the same faith that enabled our pioneers to trust God's providence in preserving His Word for every generation.

We must reject poor textual criticism that removes Scripture based on theories while maintaining sound interpretation that honors God's Word. We must apply consistent standards to all historical sources rather than accepting unsubstantiated claims that support our theological preferences. We must defend biblical text while maintaining sound non-Trinitarian interpretation that follows early Adventist principles.

The Prophetic Warning Fulfilled

Ellen White's prophetic warnings help us understand the spiritual dimensions of this controversy. Her prediction that "Satan's very last deception will be to make of none effect the testimony of the Spirit of God" describes exactly what we see today—sophisticated intellectual arguments designed to undermine confidence in both biblical and prophetic authority.

The pattern she predicted has unfolded with remarkable precision. First came attacks on institutional authority and leadership, followed by questions about the gifts themselves, ultimately leading to disregard for inspired instruction. The progression from questioning church leaders to questioning Scripture follows exactly the strategy Ellen White identified as satanic deception.

Her warning that "many think it a virtue, a mark of intelligence in them, to be unbelieving and to question and quibble" perfectly describes the current intellectual climate where questioning traditional beliefs is presented as evidence of scholarly sophistication. She identified this attitude as designed to undermine confidence in divine revelation.

Understanding the spiritual forces behind these attacks helps us respond with appropriate seriousness while maintaining confidence in ultimate victory. Truth will prevail because it rests on solid foundations rather than speculative theories. Biblical authority will endure because it reflects divine preservation rather than human preservation.

The Final Appeal

To the candid reader, the evidence speaks clearly. Matthew 28:19 belongs in our Bibles based on universal manuscript evidence that no honest scholar can deny. The passage requires no Trinitarian interpretation when understood through biblical patterns that appear consistently throughout Scrip-

ture. Early Adventist pioneers successfully maintained both biblical authority and non-Trinitarian theology without resorting to textual criticism or conspiracy theories.

Rather than engaging in destructive arguments against Scripture's text, we must defend biblical authority while seeking proper interpretation according to the light God has given His people. The battle is not over removing verses but over understanding truth. The choice is not between Trinitarian and non-Trinitarian interpretations, but between trusting divine preservation and following human speculation.

We call upon believers to follow the pioneer example of maintaining absolute confidence in biblical reliability while employing careful exegesis that allows Scripture to interpret itself. We urge students of prophecy to heed Ellen White's warnings about Satan's strategy to undermine confidence in inspired revelation. We appeal to all who love truth to choose the solid foundation of manuscript evidence over the shifting sands of conspiracy theory.

The issue ultimately comes down to this fundamental question: Will we follow Scripture's pattern and trust "to the law and to the testimony," knowing that "if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them"? Or will we follow the path of endless criticism that leads inevitably to complete loss of biblical authority?

The choice before us demands both intellectual honesty and spiritual courage. May God grant His people wisdom to choose faithfully, standing with Scripture's authority while maintaining the truth that has been entrusted to this generation. In this crucial hour, may we prove worthy of the heritage our pioneers have bequeathed to us, defending biblical authority while proclaiming truth according to the light heaven has provided.

The battle is the Lord's, and He will give victory to those who stand faithfully for His Word. May we be found among that faithful company when the final test comes, having maintained both intellectual integrity and spiritual loyalty to the God of truth who has preserved His Word for our instruction and salvation.

References

1. *Didache* 7:1, in *The Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Michael W. Holmes (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 257.
2. Justin Martyr, *First Apology* 61, in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 1, ed. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1885), 183. Full text: "For, in the name of God, the Father and Lord of the universe, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, they then receive the washing with water."
3. Tertullian, *De Baptismo* 13, in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 3, ed. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1885), 676. Full text: "For the law of baptizing has been imposed, and the formula prescribed: 'Go,' He saith, 'teach the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.' "
4. James Strong, *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1990), H8034.
5. Ibid., G3686.
6. Ellen G. White, *Testimonies for the Church*, vol. 5 (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1948), 671-672. Online
7. Ellen G. White, *Selected Messages*, book 1 (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1958), 48. Online

8. Ellen G. White, *Testimonies for the Church*, vol. 3 (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1948), 255. Online
9. Ellen G. White, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1911), 28. Online
10. Ellen G. White, *The Spirit of Prophecy*, vol. 2 (Battle Creek, MI: Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1877), 136. Online
11. Ellen G. White, *Spiritual Gifts*, vol. 3 (Battle Creek, MI: Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1864), 9. Online
12. Ellen G. White, *Testimonies for the Church*, vol. 6 (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1948), 91. Online
13. James Hope Moulton and George Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930); BDAG (Bauer-Danker-Arndt-Gingrich Greek-English Lexicon); Wilhelm Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903).
14. J.N. Andrews, "Baptism in Water," *Review and Herald*, January 22, 1880. Available online: https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Periodicals/RH/RH18800122-V55-04.pdf
15. M.C. Wilcox and E.J. Waggoner, "Into the Name," *Signs of the Times*, June 3, 1897. See Appendix A for full text.

Appendix A: "Into the Name" by M.C. Wilcox and E.J. Waggoner

Editorial (Editor: M. C. Wilcox, Assistant Editor: E. J. Waggoner)
Signs of the Times – June 3, 1897

The baptismal formula, if the expression may be so used, found in Matt. 28:19, reads: "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." R. V. The words are not designed, however, to express an exact form that should always be used (see Acts 2:38; 19:5), but to express an important fact as to what true discipleship means.

Of the Father —The Father's name is I AM, Jehovah, and it expresses the character of him who "is righteous in all his ways, and holy in all his works."… To be baptized into his name is to receive of his mercy, his compassion, his forgiveness, his goodness. It is to be made righteous. Jesus came in his Father's name, having the Father's righteousness…

Into the Name of the Son.—The one great sublime fact in the character of the Son of God is that stated in Phil. 2:5-8… To be baptized into his name is to renounce self, to give up all to God, to yield every desire, every ambition, every power and ability, and lay all at his blessed feet, that he may do with them and us as he will. This is consecration. This was the mind of Jesus. This is what must be done to be baptized in his name.

Into the Name of the Holy Ghost.—Everywhere in the Scriptures, the Holy Ghost, or the Spirit of God, is the agency of operation, the energy in working, the power of God manifest in the accomplishment of his purpose. It is the mighty life-force working out God's will in harmony with his holy law. It was the creative power in the beginning in creation, brooding over chaos and bringing forth order. Gen. I:2. It is the power which recreates and peoples again the desolate earth. Ps. 104:30. It changes the heart and mind and gives birth to the new man in Christ Jesus. Eze. 36:26, 27; Ps. 51:10-12; John 3:3-5. It is that power in the Word by which we are sanctified, by which we are enabled to fulfill the righteousness of God's law, manifest in the fruits of the Spirit

in our lives. In short, it is by that mighty Spirit, that divine life and energy, that the love of God comes into the heart which erstwhile hated God's law, which rested upon our Lord with such fulness, which enabled him to work miracles, which fitted him for his blessed work of "doing good." Rom. 5:5; John 3:34; Matt. 12:28; Luke 4:18; Acts 10:38.

It is the Spirit of God, the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit of Truth and of Grace, the Comforter, the mighty life-force and fulness of Deity, sent down to the world to save them and keep them.

Baptized into Service.—The baptism of the Spirit, being baptized into the name of the Holy Ghost, or Holy Spirit (Hagios Pneuma), is a baptism for service. It is the preparation which God gives that we may do his work in his way. But this baptism must be preceded by cleansing from sin and emptying of self…

Into His Name.—And yet while the matter is expressed in detail in Matt. 28:19 (R. V.), "into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," it is all included in the name of Jesus Christ; "for in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. And ye are complete in him." Col. 2:9, 10. In him was the Father's name or character, his own character, and the fulness of the Spirit. Therefore when we read that the apostles baptized in his name, they carried out our Lord's injunction. Acts 19:5. The Spirit of God is his representative here, his life given to his children to fit them for service. Those who truly receive Christ will receive his Spirit also.